

1 NICOLE M. SMITH (CA SBN 189598)  
2 NSmith@mofo.com  
3 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
4 707 Wilshire Boulevard  
5 Suite 6000  
6 Los Angeles, CA 90017-3543  
7 Phone: 213.892-5200  
8 Facsimile: 213.892-5454

9  
10 KYLE W.K. MOONEY (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
11 KMooney@mofo.com  
12 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
13 250 West 55th Street  
14 New York, NY 10019-9601  
15 Telephone: (212) 468-8000  
16 Facsimile: (212) 468-7900

17 Attorneys for Defendant  
18 DECO ENTERPRISES, INC.

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
WESTERN DIVISION

15 PHILIPS LIGHTING NORTH  
16 AMERICA CORPORATION and  
17 PHILIPS LIGHTING HOLDING B.V.,

18 Plaintiffs and  
19 Counterclaim-  
20 Defendants,

21 v.

22 DECO ENTERPRISES, INC. (d/b/a  
23 DECO LIGHTING),

24 Defendant and  
25 Counterclaim-  
26 Plaintiff.

Case No. 2:17-cv-04995-R-AGR  
Action Filed: April 12, 2017

Hon. Manuel L. Real

**AMENDED ANSWER TO  
AMENDED COMPLAINT AND  
AMENDED COUNTERCLAIMS  
DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

27  
28  
AND AMENDED COUNTERCLAIMS

**AMENDED ANSWER TO AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Deco Enterprises, Inc. (d/b/a Deco Lighting) (“Deco”) responds to the Amended Complaint filed by Plaintiffs Philips Lighting North America Corporation and Philips Lighting Holding B.V. (collectively, “Philips Lighting”) as follows:

6        1.     Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 1, except admits that Philips  
7     Lighting asserts claims for alleged patent infringement arising under the patent laws  
8     of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 1 *et seq.*, including 35 U.S.C. § 271, and seeks  
9     remedies specified under 35 U.S.C. §§ 281 and 283-285, and that this Court has  
10   subject matter jurisdiction. Deco denies that it infringes any valid patent claims or  
11   that Philips Lighting is entitled to any relief in this action.

12        2.     Deco lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to  
13 the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 2 and on that basis denies them.

14        3.     Deco lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to  
15 the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 3 and on that basis denies them.

16 || 4. Deco admits the allegations of Paragraph 4.

17        5.     Deco denies that it infringes any valid patent claim but Deco otherwise  
18 admits the allegations of Paragraph 5.

19       **6.**     Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 6, except admits that it has  
20 made, used, sold, offered for sale in the United States, and/or imported into the  
21 United States, lighting products incorporating light-emitting diodes (“LEDs”), that  
22 its products are available in California, and refers to its website for the contents  
23 thereof.

24        7.     Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 7, except admits that the  
25 Court has jurisdiction over it for purposes of this action.

26 || 8. Deco admits that venue is proper in this District.

27        9.     Deco lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to  
28 the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 9 and on that basis denies them.

1       **10.** Deco lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to  
2 the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 10 and on that basis denies them.

3       **11.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 11, except admits that U.S.  
4 Patent 6,094,014 (“the ’014 Patent”) on its face is entitled “Circuit Arrangement,  
5 and Signaling Light Provided with the Circuit Arrangement,” and has a date of  
6 issue of July 25, 2000. Deco lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a  
7 belief as to the truth of the allegations in the second sentence of Paragraph 11 and  
8 on that basis denies them.

9       **12.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 12, except admits that U.S.  
10 Patent 6,586,890 (“the ’890 Patent”) on its face is entitled “Led Driver Circuit with  
11 PWM Output,” and has a date of issue of July 1, 2003. Deco lacks knowledge or  
12 information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in the second  
13 sentence of Paragraph 12 and on that basis denies them.

14       **13.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 13, except admits that U.S.  
15 Patent 7,038,399 (“the ’399 Patent”) on its face is entitled “Methods and Apparatus  
16 for Providing Power to Lighting Devices,” and has a date of issue of May 2, 2006.  
17 Deco lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of  
18 the allegations in the second sentence of Paragraph 13 and on that basis denies  
19 them.

20       **14.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 14, except admits that U.S.  
21 Patent 7,262,559 (“the ’559 Patent”) on its face is entitled “LED Drivers,” and has a  
22 date of issue of August 28, 2007. Deco lacks knowledge or information sufficient  
23 to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in the second sentence of  
24 Paragraph 14 and on that basis denies them.

25       **15.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 15, except admits that U.S.  
26 Patent 8,070,328 (“the ’328 Patent”) on its face is entitled “LED Downlight,” and  
27 has a date of issue of July 25, 2000. Deco lacks knowledge or information

1 sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in the second sentence of  
2 Paragraph 15 and on that basis denies them.

3       **16.** Deco admits the allegations of Paragraph 16.

4       **17.** Deco admits the allegations of Paragraph 17 and refers to its website  
5 and the available specifications thereon for their contents.

6       **18.** Deco lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to  
7 the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 18 and on that basis denies them.

8       **19.** Deco admits the allegations of Paragraph 19.

9       **20.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 20, except admits that the  
10 image from Exhibit 9 appears to show a Zeus product.

11       **21.** Deco lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to  
12 the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 21 and on that basis denies them.

13       **22.** Deco admits the allegations of Paragraph 22.

14       **23.** Deco admits the allegations of Paragraph 23 and refers to Exhibit 13  
15 for its contents.

16       **24.** Deco lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to  
17 the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 24 and on that basis denies them.

18       **25.** Deco admits the allegations of Paragraph 25.

19       **26.** Deco admits the allegations of Paragraph 26 and refers to its website  
20 and the available specifications thereon for their contents.

21       **27.** Deco lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to  
22 the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 27 and on that basis denies them.

23       **28.** Deco admits the allegations of Paragraph 28.

24       **29.** Deco admits the allegations of Paragraph 29 and refers to its website  
25 and the available specifications thereon for their contents.

26       **30.** Deco lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to  
27 the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 30 and on that basis denies them.

28       **31.** Deco admits the allegations of Paragraph 31.

1       **32.** Deco lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to  
2 the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 32 and on that basis denies them.

3       **33.** Deco lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to  
4 the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 33 and on that basis denies them.

5       **34.** Deco admits the allegations of Paragraph 34.

6       **35.** Deco admits the allegations of Paragraph 35 and refers to its website  
7 and the available specifications thereon for their contents.

8       **36.** Deco lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to  
9 the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 36 and on that basis denies them.

10       **37.** Deco lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to  
11 the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 37 and on that basis denies them.

12       **38.** Deco admits the allegations of Paragraph 38.

13       **39.** Deco admits the allegations of Paragraph 39 and refers to its website  
14 and the available specifications thereon for their contents.

15       **40.** Deco lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about  
16 the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 40 and on that basis denies them.

17       **41.** Deco incorporates by reference herein its answers to Paragraphs 1-40  
18 as if fully set forth herein.

19       **42.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 42.

20       **43.** Deco admits the allegations of Paragraph 43.

21       **44.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 44.

22       **45.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
23 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
24 of the allegations of Paragraph 45 and on that basis denies them, except Deco  
25 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components cited below  
26 refer to Exhibit 10 unless stated otherwise.” Deco further states that it does not  
27 infringe any valid claim of the ’014 Patent that Philips Lighting has asserted against  
28 it in this action.

1       **46.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
2 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
3 of the allegations of Paragraph 46 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
4 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '014 Patent that Philips  
5 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

6       **47.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
7 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
8 of the allegations of Paragraph 47 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
9 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '014 Patent that Philips  
10 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

11       **48.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
12 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
13 of the allegations of Paragraph 48 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
14 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '014 Patent that Philips  
15 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

16       **49.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
17 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
18 of the allegations of Paragraph 49 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
19 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '014 Patent that Philips  
20 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

21       **50.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
22 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
23 of the allegations of Paragraph 50 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
24 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '014 Patent that Philips  
25 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

26       **51.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
27 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
28 of the allegations of Paragraph 51 and on that basis denies them, except Deco

1 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components of the Cloud  
2 products cited below refer to Exhibit 14 unless stated otherwise.” Deco further  
3 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the ’014 Patent that Philips  
4 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

5 **52.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
6 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
7 of the allegations of Paragraph 52 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
8 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the ’014 Patent that Philips  
9 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

10 **53.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
11 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
12 of the allegations of Paragraph 53 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
13 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the ’014 Patent that Philips  
14 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

15 **54.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
16 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
17 of the allegations of Paragraph 54 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
18 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the ’014 Patent that Philips  
19 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

20 **55.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
21 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
22 of the allegations of Paragraph 55 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
23 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the ’014 Patent that Philips  
24 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

25 **56.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
26 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
27 of the allegations of Paragraph 56 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
28

1 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '014 Patent that Philips  
2 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

3       **57.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
4 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
5 of the allegations of Paragraph 57 and on that basis denies them, except Deco  
6 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components of the DECO  
7 DSW-LED products cited below refer to Exhibit 20 unless stated otherwise.” Deco  
8 further states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '014 Patent that Philips  
9 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

10       **58.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
11 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
12 of the allegations of Paragraph 58 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
13 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '014 Patent that Philips  
14 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

15       **59.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
16 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
17 of the allegations of Paragraph 59 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
18 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '014 Patent that Philips  
19 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

20       **60.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
21 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
22 of the allegations of Paragraph 60 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
23 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '014 Patent that Philips  
24 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

25       **61.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
26 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
27 of the allegations of Paragraph 61 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
28

1 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '014 Patent that Philips  
2 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

3       **62.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
4 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
5 of the allegations of Paragraph 62 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
6 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '014 Patent that Philips  
7 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

8       **63.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
9 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
10 of the allegations of Paragraph 63 and on that basis denies them, except Deco  
11 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components of 211-LED  
12 products cited below refer to Exhibit 14 unless states otherwise.” Deco further  
13 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '014 Patent that Philips  
14 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

15       **64.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
16 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
17 of the allegations of Paragraph 64 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
18 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '014 Patent that Philips  
19 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

20       **65.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
21 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
22 of the allegations of Paragraph 65 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
23 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '014 Patent that Philips  
24 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

25       **66.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
26 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
27 of the allegations of Paragraph 66 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
28

1 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '014 Patent that Philips  
2 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

3       **67.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
4 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
5 of the allegations of Paragraph 67 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
6 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '014 Patent that Philips  
7 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

8       **68.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
9 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
10 of the allegations of Paragraph 68 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
11 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '014 Patent that Philips  
12 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

13       **69.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
14 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
15 of the allegations of Paragraph 69 and on that basis denies them, except Deco  
16 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components cited below  
17 refer to Exhibit 14 unless stated otherwise.” Deco further states that it does not  
18 infringe any valid claim of the '014 Patent that Philips Lighting has asserted against  
19 it in this action.

20       **70.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
21 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
22 of the allegations of Paragraph 70 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
23 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '014 Patent that Philips  
24 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

25       **71.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
26 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
27 of the allegations of Paragraph 71 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
28

1 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '014 Patent that Philips  
2 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

3       **72.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
4 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
5 of the allegations of Paragraph 72 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
6 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '014 Patent that Philips  
7 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

8       **73.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
9 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
10 of the allegations of Paragraph 73 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
11 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '014 Patent that Philips  
12 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

13       **74.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 74.

14       **75.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 75.

15       **76.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 76.

16       **77.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 77, except admits that Deco  
17 was aware of the '014 Patent as early as the service of the Amended Complaint.

18       **78.** Deco incorporates by reference herein its answers to Paragraphs 1-77  
19 as if fully set forth herein.

20       **79.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 79.

21       **80.** Deco admits the allegations of Paragraph 80.

22       **81.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 81.

23       **82.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
24 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
25 of the allegations of Paragraph 82 and on that basis denies them, except Deco  
26 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components cited below  
27 refer to Exhibit 7 unless stated otherwise.” Deco further states that it does not  
28

1 infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips Lighting has asserted against  
2 it in this action.

3       **83.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
4 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
5 of the allegations of Paragraph 83 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
6 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
7 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

8       **84.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
9 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
10 of the allegations of Paragraph 84 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
11 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
12 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

13       **85.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
14 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
15 of the allegations of Paragraph 85 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
16 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
17 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

18       **86.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
19 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
20 of the allegations of Paragraph 86 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
21 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
22 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

23       **87.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
24 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
25 of the allegations of Paragraph 87 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
26 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
27 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

28

1       **88.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
2 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
3 of the allegations of Paragraph 88 and on that basis denies them, except Deco  
4 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components cited below  
5 refer to Exhibit 10 unless states otherwise.” Deco further states that it does not  
6 infringe any valid claim of the ’890 Patent that Philips Lighting has asserted against  
7 it in this action.

8       **89.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
9 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
10 of the allegations of Paragraph 89 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
11 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the ’890 Patent that Philips  
12 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

13       **90.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
14 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
15 of the allegations of Paragraph 90 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
16 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the ’890 Patent that Philips  
17 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

18       **91.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
19 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
20 of the allegations of Paragraph 91 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
21 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the ’890 Patent that Philips  
22 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

23       **92.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
24 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
25 of the allegations of Paragraph 92 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
26 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the ’890 Patent that Philips  
27 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

28

1       **93.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
2 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
3 of the allegations of Paragraph 93 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
4 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
5 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

6       **94.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
7 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
8 of the allegations of Paragraph 94 and on that basis denies them, except Deco  
9 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components cited below  
10 refer to Exhibit 18 unless stated otherwise.” Deco further states that it does not  
11 infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips Lighting has asserted against  
12 it in this action.

13       **95.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
14 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
15 of the allegations of Paragraph 95 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
16 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
17 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

18       **96.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
19 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
20 of the allegations of Paragraph 96 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
21 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
22 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

23       **97.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
24 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
25 of the allegations of Paragraph 97 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
26 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
27 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

28

1       **98.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
2 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
3 of the allegations of Paragraph 98 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
4 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
5 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

6       **99.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
7 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
8 of the allegations of Paragraph 99 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
9 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
10 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

11       **100.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
12 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
13 of the allegations of Paragraph 100 and on that basis denies them, except admits  
14 that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components cited below refer to  
15 Exhibit 20 unless stated otherwise.” Deco further states that it does not infringe  
16 any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips Lighting has asserted against it in  
17 this action.

18       **101.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
19 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
20 of the allegations of Paragraph 101 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
21 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
22 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

23       **102.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
24 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
25 of the allegations of Paragraph 102 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
26 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
27 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

28

1       **103.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
2 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
3 of the allegations of Paragraph 103 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
4 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
5 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

6       **104.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
7 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
8 of the allegations of Paragraph 104 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
9 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
10 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

11       **105.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
12 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
13 of the allegations of Paragraph 105 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
14 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
15 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

16       **106.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
17 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
18 of the allegations of Paragraph 106 and on that basis denies them, except admits  
19 that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components cited below refer to  
20 Exhibit 27 unless states otherwise.” Deco further states that it does not infringe any  
21 valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips Lighting has asserted against it in this  
22 action.

23       **107.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
24 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
25 of the allegations of Paragraph 107 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
26 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
27 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

28

1       **108.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
2 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
3 of the allegations of Paragraph 108 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
4 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
5 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

6       **109.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
7 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
8 of the allegations of Paragraph 109 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
9 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
10 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

11       **110.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
12 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
13 of the allegations of Paragraph 110 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
14 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
15 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

16       **111.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
17 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
18 of the allegations of Paragraph 111 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
19 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
20 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

21       **112.** Deco admits the allegations of Paragraph 112.

22       **113.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 113.

23       **114.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
24 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
25 of the allegations of Paragraph 114 and on that basis denies them, except Deco  
26 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components cited below  
27 refer to Exhibit 7 unless stated otherwise.” Deco further states that it does not  
28

1 infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips Lighting has asserted against  
2 it in this action.

3       **115.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
4 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
5 of the allegations of Paragraph 115 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
6 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
7 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

8       **116.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
9 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
10 of the allegations of Paragraph 116 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
11 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
12 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

13       **117.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
14 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
15 of the allegations of Paragraph 117 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
16 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
17 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

18       **118.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
19 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
20 of the allegations of Paragraph 118 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
21 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
22 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

23       **119.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
24 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
25 of the allegations of Paragraph 119 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
26 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
27 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

28

1       **120.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
2 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
3 of the allegations of Paragraph 120 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
4 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
5 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

6       **121.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
7 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
8 of the allegations of Paragraph 121 and on that basis denies them, except Deco  
9 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components cited below  
10 refer to Exhibit 10 unless stated otherwise.” Deco further states that it does not  
11 infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips Lighting has asserted against  
12 it in this action.

13       **122.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
14 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
15 of the allegations of Paragraph 122 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
16 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
17 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

18       **123.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
19 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
20 of the allegations of Paragraph 123 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
21 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
22 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

23       **124.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
24 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
25 of the allegations of Paragraph 124 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
26 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
27 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

28

1       **125.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
2 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
3 of the allegations of Paragraph 125 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
4 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
5 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

6       **126.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
7 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
8 of the allegations of Paragraph 126 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
9 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
10 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

11       **127.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
12 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
13 of the allegations of Paragraph 127 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
14 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
15 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

16       **128.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
17 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
18 of the allegations of Paragraph 128 and on that basis denies them, except Deco  
19 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components cited below  
20 refer to Exhibit 18 unless stated otherwise.” Deco further states that it does not  
21 infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips Lighting has asserted against  
22 it in this action.

23       **129.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
24 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
25 of the allegations of Paragraph 129 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
26 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
27 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

28

1       **130.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
2 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
3 of the allegations of Paragraph 130 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
4 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
5 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

6       **131.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
7 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
8 of the allegations of Paragraph 131 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
9 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
10 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

11       **132.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
12 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
13 of the allegations of Paragraph 132 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
14 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
15 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

16       **133.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
17 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
18 of the allegations of Paragraph 133 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
19 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
20 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

21       **134.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
22 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
23 of the allegations of Paragraph 134 and on that basis denies them, except Deco  
24 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components cited below  
25 refer to Exhibit 20 unless stated otherwise.” Deco further states that it does not  
26 infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips Lighting has asserted against  
27 it in this action.

28

1       **135.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
2 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
3 of the allegations of Paragraph 135 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
4 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
5 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

6       **136.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
7 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
8 of the allegations of Paragraph 136 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
9 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
10 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

11       **137.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
12 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
13 of the allegations of Paragraph 137 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
14 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
15 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

16       **138.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
17 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
18 of the allegations of Paragraph 138 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
19 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
20 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

21       **139.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
22 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
23 of the allegations of Paragraph 139 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
24 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
25 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

26       **140.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
27 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
28 of the allegations of Paragraph 140 and on that basis denies them, except Deco

1 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components of D404-  
2 LED cited below refer to Exhibit 27 unless stated otherwise.” Deco further states  
3 that it does not infringe any valid claim of the ’890 Patent that Philips Lighting has  
4 asserted against it in this action.

5 **141.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
6 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
7 of the allegations of Paragraph 141 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
8 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the ’890 Patent that Philips  
9 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

10 **142.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
11 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
12 of the allegations of Paragraph 142 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
13 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the ’890 Patent that Philips  
14 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

15 **143.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
16 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
17 of the allegations of Paragraph 143 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
18 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the ’890 Patent that Philips  
19 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

20 **144.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
21 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
22 of the allegations of Paragraph 144 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
23 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the ’890 Patent that Philips  
24 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

25 **145.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
26 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
27 of the allegations of Paragraph 145 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
28

1 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '890 Patent that Philips  
 2 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

3       **146.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 146.

4       **147.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 147.

5       **148.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 148.

6       **149.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 149, except Deco admits that  
 7 it has been aware of the '890 Patent at least as early as the service of the Amended  
 8 Complaint.

9       **150.** Deco incorporates by reference herein its responses to Paragraphs 1-  
 10 149 as if fully set forth herein.

11       **151.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 151.

12       **152.** Deco admits the allegations of Paragraph 152.

13       **153.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 153.

14       **154.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
 15 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
 16 of the allegations of Paragraph 154 and on that basis denies them, except Deco  
 17 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he components cited below refer to  
 18 Exhibit 10 unless stated otherwise.” Deco further states that it does not infringe  
 19 any valid claim of the '399 Patent that Philips Lighting has asserted against it in  
 20 this action.

21       **155.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
 22 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
 23 of the allegations of Paragraph 155 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
 24 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '399 Patent that Philips  
 25 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

26       **156.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
 27 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
 28 of the allegations of Paragraph 156 and on that basis denies them. Deco further

1 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '399 Patent that Philips  
2 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

3       **157.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
4 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
5 of the allegations of Paragraph 157 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
6 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '399 Patent that Philips  
7 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

8       **158.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
9 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
10 of the allegations of Paragraph 158 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
11 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '399 Patent that Philips  
12 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

13       **159.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
14 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
15 of the allegations of Paragraph 159 and on that basis denies them, except Deco  
16 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he components cited below refer to  
17 Exhibit 24 unless stated otherwise.” Deco further states that it does not infringe  
18 any valid claim of the '399 Patent that Philips Lighting has asserted against it in  
19 this action.

20       **160.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
21 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
22 of the allegations of Paragraph 160 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
23 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '399 Patent that Philips  
24 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

25       **161.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
26 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
27 of the allegations of Paragraph 161 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
28

1 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '399 Patent that Philips  
2 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

3       **162.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
4 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
5 of the allegations of Paragraph 162 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
6 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '399 Patent that Philips  
7 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

8       **163.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
9 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
10 of the allegations of Paragraph 163 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
11 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '399 Patent that Philips  
12 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

13       **164.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
14 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
15 of the allegations of Paragraph 164 and on that basis denies them, except Deco  
16 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components of D404-  
17 LED cited below refer to Exhibit 27 unless stated otherwise.” Deco further states  
18 that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '399 Patent that Philips Lighting has  
19 asserted against it in this action.

20       **165.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
21 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
22 of the allegations of Paragraph 165 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
23 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '399 Patent that Philips  
24 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

25       **166.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
26 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
27 of the allegations of Paragraph 166 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
28

1 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '399 Patent that Philips  
2 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

3       **167.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
4 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
5 of the allegations of Paragraph 167 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
6 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '399 Patent that Philips  
7 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

8       **168.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
9 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
10 of the allegations of Paragraph 168 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
11 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '399 Patent that Philips  
12 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

13       **169.** Deco admits the allegations of Paragraph 169.

14       **170.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 170.

15       **171.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
16 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
17 of the allegations of Paragraph 171 and on that basis denies them, except Deco  
18 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components of Zeus cited  
19 below refer to Exhibit 10 unless stated otherwise.” Deco further states that it does  
20 not infringe any valid claim of the '399 Patent that Philips Lighting has asserted  
21 against it in this action.

22       **172.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
23 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
24 of the allegations of Paragraph 172 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
25 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '399 Patent that Philips  
26 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

27       **173.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
28 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth

1 of the allegations of Paragraph 173 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
2 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '399 Patent that Philips  
3 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

4 **174.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
5 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
6 of the allegations of Paragraph 174 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
7 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '399 Patent that Philips  
8 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

9 **175.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
10 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
11 of the allegations of Paragraph 175 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
12 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '399 Patent that Philips  
13 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

14 **176.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
15 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
16 of the allegations of Paragraph 176 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
17 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '399 Patent that Philips  
18 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

19 **177.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
20 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
21 of the allegations of Paragraph 177 and on that basis denies them, except Deco  
22 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[he individual components of D404-LED  
23 cited below refer to Exhibit 27.” Deco further states that it does not infringe any  
24 valid claim of the '399 Patent that Philips Lighting has asserted against it in this  
25 action.

26 **178.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
27 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
28 of the allegations of Paragraph 178 and on that basis denies them. Deco further

1 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '399 Patent that Philips  
2 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

3       **179.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
4 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
5 of the allegations of Paragraph 179 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
6 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '399 Patent that Philips  
7 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

8       **180.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
9 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
10 of the allegations of Paragraph 180 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
11 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '399 Patent that Philips  
12 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

13       **181.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
14 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
15 of the allegations of Paragraph 181 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
16 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '399 Patent that Philips  
17 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

18       **182.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
19 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
20 of the allegations of Paragraph 182 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
21 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '399 Patent that Philips  
22 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

23       **183.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 183.

24       **184.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 184.

25       **185.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 185.

26       **186.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 186, except Deco admits  
27 Philips notified Deco of the '399 Patent on October 21, 2013.

28

1       **187.** Deco incorporates by reference herein its responses to Paragraphs 1 -  
2 186 as if fully set forth herein.

3       **188.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 188.

4       **189.** Deco admits the allegations of Paragraph 189.

5       **190.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 190.

6       **191.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
7 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
8 of the allegations of Paragraph 191 and on that basis denies them, except Deco  
9 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components cited below  
10 refer to Exhibit 7 unless stated otherwise.” Deco further states that it does not  
11 infringe any valid claim of the ’559 Patent that Philips Lighting has asserted against  
12 it in this action.

13       **192.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
14 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
15 of the allegations of Paragraph 192 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
16 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the ’559 Patent that Philips  
17 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

18       **193.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
19 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
20 of the allegations of Paragraph 193 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
21 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the ’559 Patent that Philips  
22 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

23       **194.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
24 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
25 of the allegations of Paragraph 194 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
26 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the ’559 Patent that Philips  
27 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

28

1       **195.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
2 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
3 of the allegations of Paragraph 195 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
4 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
5 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

6       **196.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
7 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
8 of the allegations of Paragraph 196 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
9 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
10 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

11       **197.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
12 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
13 of the allegations of Paragraph 197 and on that basis denies them, except Deco  
14 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components cited below  
15 refer to Exhibit 10 unless stated otherwise.” Deco further states that it does not  
16 infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips Lighting has asserted against  
17 it in this action.

18       **198.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
19 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
20 of the allegations of Paragraph 198 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
21 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
22 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

23       **199.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
24 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
25 of the allegations of Paragraph 199 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
26 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
27 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

28

1       **200.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
2 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
3 of the allegations of Paragraph 200 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
4 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
5 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

6       **201.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
7 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
8 of the allegations of Paragraph 201 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
9 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
10 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

11       **202.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
12 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
13 of the allegations of Paragraph 202 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
14 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
15 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

16       **203.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
17 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
18 of the allegations of Paragraph 203 and on that basis denies them, except Deco  
19 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components of Cloud  
20 cited below refer to Exhibit 14 unless stated otherwise.” Deco further states that it  
21 does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips Lighting has  
22 asserted against it in this action.

23       **204.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
24 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
25 of the allegations of Paragraph 204 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
26 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
27 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

28

1       **205.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
2 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
3 of the allegations of Paragraph 205 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
4 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
5 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

6       **206.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
7 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
8 of the allegations of Paragraph 206 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
9 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
10 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

11       **207.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
12 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
13 of the allegations of Paragraph 207 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
14 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
15 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

16       **208.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
17 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
18 of the allegations of Paragraph 208 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
19 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
20 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

21       **209.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
22 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
23 of the allegations of Paragraph 209 and on that basis denies them, except Deco  
24 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components cited below  
25 refer to Exhibit 18 unless stated otherwise.” Deco further states that it does not  
26 infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips Lighting has asserted against  
27 it in this action.

28

1       **210.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
2 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
3 of the allegations of Paragraph 210 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
4 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
5 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

6       **211.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
7 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
8 of the allegations of Paragraph 211 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
9 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
10 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

11       **212.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
12 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
13 of the allegations of Paragraph 212 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
14 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
15 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

16       **213.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
17 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
18 of the allegations of Paragraph 213 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
19 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
20 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

21       **214.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
22 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
23 of the allegations of Paragraph 214 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
24 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
25 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

26       **215.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
27 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
28 of the allegations of Paragraph 215 and on that basis denies them, except Deco

1 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components cited below  
2 refer to Exhibit 20 unless stated otherwise.” Deco further states that it does not  
3 infringe any valid claim of the ’559 Patent that Philips Lighting has asserted against  
4 it in this action.

5 **216.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
6 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
7 of the allegations of Paragraph 216 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
8 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the ’559 Patent that Philips  
9 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

10 **217.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
11 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
12 of the allegations of Paragraph 217 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
13 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the ’559 Patent that Philips  
14 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

15 **218.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
16 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
17 of the allegations of Paragraph 218 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
18 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the ’559 Patent that Philips  
19 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

20 **219.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
21 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
22 of the allegations of Paragraph 219 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
23 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the ’559 Patent that Philips  
24 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

25 **220.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
26 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
27 of the allegations of Paragraph 220 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
28

1 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
2 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

3       **221.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
4 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
5 of the allegations of Paragraph 221 and on that basis denies them, except Deco  
6 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components cited below  
7 refer to Exhibit 14 unless stated otherwise.” Deco further states that it does not  
8 infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips Lighting has asserted against  
9 it in this action.

10       **222.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
11 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
12 of the allegations of Paragraph 222 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
13 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
14 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

15       **223.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
16 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
17 of the allegations of Paragraph 223 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
18 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
19 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

20       **224.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
21 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
22 of the allegations of Paragraph 224 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
23 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
24 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

25       **225.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
26 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
27 of the allegations of Paragraph 225 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
28

1 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
2 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

3       **226.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
4 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
5 of the allegations of Paragraph 226 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
6 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
7 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

8       **227.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
9 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
10 of the allegations of Paragraph 227 and on that basis denies them, except Deco  
11 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components cited below  
12 refer to Exhibit 14 unless stated otherwise.” Deco further states that it does not  
13 infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips Lighting has asserted against  
14 it in this action.

15       **228.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
16 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
17 of the allegations of Paragraph 228 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
18 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
19 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

20       **229.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
21 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
22 of the allegations of Paragraph 229 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
23 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
24 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

25       **230.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
26 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
27 of the allegations of Paragraph 230 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
28

1 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
2 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

3       **231.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
4 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
5 of the allegations of Paragraph 231 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
6 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
7 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

8       **232.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
9 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
10 of the allegations of Paragraph 232 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
11 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
12 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

13       **233.** Deco admits the allegations of Paragraph 233.

14       **234.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 234.

15       **235.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
16 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
17 of the allegations of Paragraph 235 and on that basis denies them, except Deco  
18 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components cited below  
19 refer to Exhibit 10 unless stated otherwise.” Deco further states that it does not  
20 infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips Lighting has asserted against  
21 it in this action.

22       **236.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
23 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
24 of the allegations of Paragraph 236 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
25 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
26 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

27       **237.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
28 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth

1 of the allegations of Paragraph 237 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
2 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
3 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

4 **238.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
5 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
6 of the allegations of Paragraph 238 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
7 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
8 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

9 **239.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
10 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
11 of the allegations of Paragraph 239 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
12 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
13 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

14 **240.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
15 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
16 of the allegations of Paragraph 240 and on that basis denies them, except Deco  
17 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components cited below  
18 refer to Exhibit 20 unless stated otherwise.” Deco further states that it does not  
19 infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips Lighting has asserted against  
20 it in this action.

21 **241.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
22 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
23 of the allegations of Paragraph 241 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
24 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
25 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

26 **242.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
27 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
28 of the allegations of Paragraph 242 and on that basis denies them. Deco further

1 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
2 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

3       **243.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
4 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
5 of the allegations of Paragraph 243 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
6 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
7 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

8       **244.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
9 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
10 of the allegations of Paragraph 244 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
11 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
12 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

13       **245.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
14 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
15 of the allegations of Paragraph 245 and on that basis denies them, except admits  
16 that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components cited below refer to  
17 Exhibit 27 unless stated otherwise.” Deco further states that it does not infringe  
18 any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips Lighting has asserted against it in  
19 this action.

20       **246.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
21 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
22 of the allegations of Paragraph 246 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
23 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
24 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

25       **247.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
26 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
27 of the allegations of Paragraph 247 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
28

1 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
2 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

3       **248.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
4 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
5 of the allegations of Paragraph 248 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
6 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
7 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

8       **249.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
9 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
10 of the allegations of Paragraph 249 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
11 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
12 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

13       **250.** Deco admits the allegations of Paragraph 250.

14       **251.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 251.

15       **252.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
16 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
17 of the allegations of Paragraph 252 and on that basis denies them, except Deco  
18 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components cited below  
19 refer to Exhibit 10 unless stated otherwise.” Deco further states that it does not  
20 infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips Lighting has asserted against  
21 it in this action.

22       **253.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
23 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
24 of the allegations of Paragraph 253 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
25 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
26 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

27       **254.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
28 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth

1 of the allegations of Paragraph 254 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
2 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
3 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

4 **255.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
5 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
6 of the allegations of Paragraph 255 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
7 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
8 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

9 **256.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
10 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
11 of the allegations of Paragraph 256 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
12 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
13 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

14 **257.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
15 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
16 of the allegations of Paragraph 257 and on that basis denies them, except Deco  
17 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components cited below  
18 refer to Exhibit 20 unless stated otherwise.” Deco further states that it does not  
19 infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips Lighting has asserted against  
20 it in this action.

21 **258.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
22 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
23 of the allegations of Paragraph 258 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
24 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
25 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

26 **259.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
27 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
28 of the allegations of Paragraph 259 and on that basis denies them. Deco further

1 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
2 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

3       **260.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
4 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
5 of the allegations of Paragraph 260 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
6 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
7 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

8       **261.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
9 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
10 of the allegations of Paragraph 261 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
11 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
12 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

13       **262.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
14 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
15 of the allegations of Paragraph 262 and on that basis denies them, except Deco  
16 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components cited below  
17 refer to Exhibit 27 unless stated otherwise.” Deco further states that it does not  
18 infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips Lighting has asserted against  
19 it in this action.

20       **263.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
21 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
22 of the allegations of Paragraph 263 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
23 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
24 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

25       **264.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
26 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
27 of the allegations of Paragraph 264 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
28

1 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
2 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

3       **265.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
4 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
5 of the allegations of Paragraph 265 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
6 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
7 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

8       **266.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
9 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
10 of the allegations of Paragraph 266 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
11 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '559 Patent that Philips  
12 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

13       **267.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 267.

14       **268.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 268.

15       **269.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 269.

16       **270.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 270, except Deco admits  
17 Philips notified Deco of the '559 Patent on October 21, 2013.

18       **271.** Deco incorporates by reference herein its answers to Paragraphs 1 –  
19 270 as if fully set forth herein.

20       **272.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 272.

21       **273.** Deco admits the allegations of Paragraph 273.

22       **274.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 274.

23       **275.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
24 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
25 of the allegations of Paragraph 275 and on that basis denies them, except Deco  
26 admits that Philips Lighting alleges that “[t]he individual components cited below  
27 refer to Exhibit 23 unless stated otherwise.” Deco further states that it does not

1 infringe any valid claim of the '328 Patent that Philips Lighting has asserted against  
2 it in this action.

3       **276.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
4 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
5 of the allegations of Paragraph 276 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
6 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '328 Patent that Philips  
7 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

8       **277.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
9 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
10 of the allegations of Paragraph 277 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
11 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '328 Patent that Philips  
12 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

13       **278.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
14 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
15 of the allegations of Paragraph 278 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
16 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '328 Patent that Philips  
17 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

18       **279.** Deco states that the recited claim language has not yet been construed  
19 and that it lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth  
20 of the allegations of Paragraph 279 and on that basis denies them. Deco further  
21 states that it does not infringe any valid claim of the '328 Patent that Philips  
22 Lighting has asserted against it in this action.

23       **280.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 280.

24       **281.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 281.

25       **282.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 282.

26       **283.** Deco denies the allegations of Paragraph 283, except Deco admits that  
27 it was aware of the '328 Patent as early as the service of the Amended Complaint.

## RESPONSE TO PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Deco denies that Philips Lighting is entitled to any relief.

## **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

## **FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE** **(Invalidity)**

The asserted claims of the '014 Patent, '890 Patent, '559 Patent, '328 Patent, and '399 Patent (collectively, the “Asserted Claims”) are invalid under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103, and/or 112. For example and without limitation:

**The '014 Patent.** Claim 1 of the '014 Patent is anticipated by at least U.S. Patent No. 5,532,894 to Sweaton, and U.S. Patent No. 5,061,861 to Sameshima. At least the following references, alone or in combination, render Claim 1 of the '014 Patent obvious: U.S. Patent No. 5,532,894 to Sweaton, U.S. Patent No. 5,061,861 to Sameshima, U.S. Patent No. 4,999,753 A to MacKenzie, U.S. Patent No. 5,327,123 to Heimann, U.S. Patent No. 5,387,908 to Henry, U.S. Patent No. 5,04,659 to Taniguchi, U.S. Patent No. 5,457,450 to Taniguchi, U.S. Patent No. 5,717,335 to Lee, and U.S. Patent No. 6,150,771 to Perry. 13. For example, with respect to Claim 1 (as that claim appears to have been construed by Philips Lighting), Sweaton discloses a circuit arrangement suitable for operating a semiconductor light source (e.g., Fig. 4), input terminals for connecting a supply voltage (e.g., Fig. 3), input filter means (e.g., 5:23-29), a converter (e.g., Fig. 4:65-67), output terminals for connecting the semiconductor light source (e.g., Fig. 4; 6:7-10), wherein said converter generates a current for application to said semiconductor light source, and said control circuit controls said converter to produce a predetermined value of said current at said output terminals (e.g., 4:65-5:5), said predetermined value of said current corresponding to an output voltage which is less than a predetermined threshold voltage characterized in that the circuit arrangement further comprises voltage detection means for detecting the output voltage at the output terminals, said voltage detection means generating a detection signal when the output voltage exceeds said predetermined threshold voltage (e.g., 5:23-33). Claim 1 of the '014 Patent is not enabled at least because "voltage

1 detection means” is not used to regulate voltage and the claim also does not require  
 2 a “switching means” which is the only disclosed means to regulate voltage.  
 3 Claim 1 of the ’014 Patent is also indefinite because, for example, “input filter  
 4 means” is indefinite and it would not be clear to a person of ordinary skill in the art  
 5 whether or not “input filter means” requires a filter.

6       **The ’890 Patent.** At least the following references, alone or in combination,  
 7 render Claims 7 and 31 of the ’890 Patent obvious: WO2001069980A1 (Barth et  
 8 al.), US Patent No. 6,590,343 to Pederson, and US Patent No. 6,400,101 to Biebl et  
 9 al. For example, with respect to Claim 7 (as the claim appears to have been  
 10 construed by Philips Lighting), Barth discloses a control circuit that provides power  
 11 to at least one LED (e.g., Fig. 1), sensing current flowing through the LED (e.g.,  
 12 Fig. 1 and 6), generating a reference signal (e.g., Fig. 7 and 8), comparing the  
 13 sensed signal to the reference signal (e.g., Fig. 1, 2, and 7), means for modulating  
 14 pulse width responsive to the feedback signal, said pulse width modulating means  
 15 generating a drive signal (e.g., Fig. 1 and 7), and means for supplying power  
 16 responsive to the drive signal, said power supplying means supplying current to the  
 17 LED array (e.g., Fig. 7 and 8a). Pederson discloses a system for supplying power  
 18 for an LED array (e.g., 3:45-50), a microcontroller that senses current to an LED  
 19 module and generates a sensed current signal (e.g., Figs. 24, 26, 20:47-54), a look-  
 20 up table for generating a reference signal (e.g., Figs. 26-28, 21:61-22:20), a  
 21 microcontroller for comparing the sensed current signal and the reference signal  
 22 from the look-up table and an increased or decreased current signal (e.g., Figs. 26-  
 23 28, 21:61-22:20), a microcontroller and compensation software for modulating  
 24 pulse width and generating a drive signal (e.g., Figs. 24, 26, 20:53-67), and a  
 25 microcontroller for adjusting the current to an LED replacement module responsive  
 26 to drive signal (e.g., Figs. 27, 28, 24:66-25:18). In addition, the United States  
 27 Patent and Trademark Office already invalidated Claim 23 of the ’890 Patent,  
 28 finding that Biebl discloses all of the elements of Claim 23. Case IPR2015-01292,

1 Paper 64, November 23, 2016. The additional limitation of dependent Claim 31 (as  
 2 Philips Lighting appears to construe that claim) is disclosed by Barth. Barth  
 3 discloses a power supply selected from a group consisting of a buck-boost power  
 4 supply, a boost power supply, a buck power supply, and a flyback converter" (e.g.,  
 5 Fig. 2).

6 **The '559 Patent.** At least the following references, alone or in combination,  
 7 render Claims 6, 10, and 11 of the '559 Patent obvious: US Patent No. 6,747,420  
 8 to Barth et al. and US Patent No. 4,496,939 to Moberg. For example, with respect  
 9 to Claim 6 (as Philips Lighting appears to construe that claim), Barth discloses a  
 10 power supply for an LED light source (e.g., Fig. 1), a power converter operable to  
 11 provide a regulated power including a LED current and a LED voltage (e.g., Fig. 1  
 12 and 6), an LED control switch operable to control a flow of the LED current  
 13 through the LED light source (e.g., Fig. 2), a detection circuit operable to provide a  
 14 detection signal indicative of an operating condition of the LED light source  
 15 associated with the LED voltage (e.g., 1:42-57); wherein said LED control switch is  
 16 further operable to clamp a peak of the LED current during an initial loading stage  
 17 of the LED light source (e.g., 6:3-14); wherein the detection signal has a first level  
 18 representative of a load condition of the LED light source (e.g., 1:42-57), and  
 19 wherein the detection signal has a second level representative of either a short  
 20 condition or an open condition of the LED light source (e.g., 5:54-6:26). In  
 21 addition, Moberg discloses an oscillating control and claim circuit to clamp a peak  
 22 of the LED current during an initial loading stage of the LED (e.g., Figs. 1-2, 3:63-  
 23 4:12). For example with respect to Claim 10 (as Philips Lighting appears to  
 24 construe that claim), Barth discloses a power supply for an LED light source (e.g.,  
 25 Fig. 1), a power converter operable to provide a regulated power including a LED  
 26 current and a LED voltage (e.g., Fig. 1 and 6; 3:44-53), an LED control switch  
 27 operable to control a flow of the LED current through the LED light source (e.g.,  
 28 Fig. 2; 4:62-5:13), a current sensor operable to sense the LED current flowing

1 through the LED light source (e.g., Fig. 2 and 6; 1:42-57), a differential amplifier  
 2 (e.g., Fig. 2 and 6; 4:62-5:13), and means for adjusting a gain of said differential  
 3 amplifier (e.g., Fig. 6; 6:3-14), wherein said LED control switch is further operable  
 4 to clamp a peak of the LED current during an initial loading stage of the LED light  
 5 source (e.g., 6:3-14). Moberg discloses an oscillating control and claim circuit to  
 6 clamp a peak of the LED current during an initial loading stage of the LED (e.g.,  
 7 Figs. 1-2, 3:63-4:12). For example, with respect to Claim 11 (as Philips Lighting  
 8 appears to construe that claim), Barth discloses a power supply for an LED light  
 9 source (e.g., Fig. 1), a power converter operable to provide a regulated power  
 10 including a LED current and a LED voltage (e.g., Fig. 1 and 6; 3:44-53), an LED  
 11 control switch operable to control a flow of the LED current through the LED light  
 12 source (e.g., Fig. 2; 4:62-5:13), a voltage sensor operable to sense the LED voltage  
 13 applied to the LED light source, said voltage sensor including (e.g., Fig. 2 and 6;  
 14 1:42-57), a differential amplifier (e.g., Fig. 2 and 6; 4:62-5:13), and means for  
 15 adjusting a gain of said differential amplifier (e.g., Fig. 6; 6:3-14), wherein said  
 16 LED control switch is further operable to clamp a peak of the LED current during  
 17 an initial loading stage of the LED light source (e.g., 6:3-14). In addition, Moberg  
 18 discloses an oscillating control and claim circuit to clamp a peak of the LED current  
 19 during an initial loading stage of the LED (e.g., Figs. 1-2, 3:63-4:12). Claims 6, 10,  
 20 and 11 of the '559 Patent are indefinite because, for example, “a power converter  
 21 operable to provide regulated power including a LED current and a LED voltage” is  
 22 indefinite and the corresponding structure is not disclosed and would not be clear to  
 23 a person of ordinary skill in the art.

24       **The '399 Patent.** Claims 7 and 17 of the '399 Patent are anticipated at least  
 25 by U.S. Patent Appl. No. 2002/0122309A1 to Abdelhafez. At least the following  
 26 references, alone or in combination, render Claims 7 and 17 of the '399 Patent  
 27 obvious: U.S. Patent Appl. No. 2002/0122309A1 to Abdelhafez and U.S. Patent  
 28 No. 6,225,759 to Bogdan. For example, with respect to Claim 7 (as Philips

1 Lighting appears to construe that claim), Bogden in view of Abdelhafez discloses  
2 an illumination apparatus (e.g., Bogden at Abstract), an LED (e.g., Abdelhafez at  
3 [0011]), at least one controller coupled to the at least one LED and configured to  
4 receive a power-related signal from an alternating current (A.C.) power source that  
5 provides signals other than a standard A.C. line voltage, the at least one controller  
6 further configured to provide power to the at least one LED based on the power-  
7 related signal (e.g., Bogden at Fig. 1 and 3(a)-(d); 2:41-3:5), wherein the A.C.  
8 power source is an A.C. dimmer circuit (e.g., Bogdan Fig. 1), wherein the A.C.  
9 dimmer circuit is controlled by a user interface to vary the power-related signal, and  
10 wherein the at least one controller is configured to variably control at least one  
11 parameter of light generated by the at least one LED in response to operation of the  
12 user interface (e.g., Bogdan at 5:17-27, 14:52-15:7; Abdelhafez at [0040], [0046]),  
13 and wherein the operation of the user interface varies a duty cycle of the power-  
14 related signal, and wherein the at least one controller is configured to variably  
15 control the at least one parameter of the light based at least on the variable duty  
16 cycle of the power-related signal (e.g., Bogden at 10:5-35, 11:12-22, Fig. 5(a) and  
17 (b)). For example, with respect to Claim 17 (as Philips Lighting appears to  
18 construe that claim), Bogden in view of Abdelhafez discloses an illumination  
19 apparatus (e.g., Bogden at Abstract), an LED (e.g., Abdelhafez at [0011]), at least  
20 one controller coupled to the at least one LED and configured to receive a power-  
21 related signal from an alternating current (A.C.) power source that provides signals  
22 other than a standard A.C. line voltage, the at least one controller further configured  
23 to provide power to the at least one LED based on the power-related signal (e.g.,  
24 Bogden at Fig. 1 and 3(a)-(d); 2:41-3:5), wherein the A.C. power source is an A.C.  
25 dimmer circuit (e.g., Bogdan Fig. 1), wherein the A.C. dimmer circuit is controlled  
26 by a user interface to vary the power-related signal, and wherein the at least one  
27 controller is configured to variably control at least one parameter of light generated  
28 by the at least one LED in response to operation of the user interface (e.g., Bogdan

1 at 5:17-27, 14:52-15:7; Abdelhafez at [0040], [0046]), wherein the at least one  
 2 controller includes: an adjustment circuit to variably control the at least one  
 3 parameter of light based on the varying power-related signal (e.g., Bogden at 10:5-  
 4 35, 11:12-22, Fig. 5(a) and (b)), and power circuitry to provide at least the power to  
 5 the at least one LED based on the varying power-related signal (e.g., Bogden Fig. 1  
 6 and 6(b), 5:10-14).

7 **The '328 Patent.** Claim 1 of the '328 Patent is anticipated at least by U.S.  
 8 Patent Appl. Publ. No. 2009/0067172A1 to Inoue. At least the following  
 9 references, alone or in combination, render Claim 1 of the '328 Patent obvious:  
 10 U.S. Patent Appl. Publ. No. 2009/0067172A1 to Inoue and U.S. Patent No.  
 11 6,033,093 to Latsis. For example, with respect to Claim 1 (as Philips Lighting  
 12 appears to construe that claim), Inoue discloses an LED downlight fixture (e.g.,  
 13 [0002]), an array of LEDs in thermal connectivity with a heatsink, said array of  
 14 LEDs positioned adjacent a first aperture of a multi-piece reflector assembly (e.g.,  
 15 [0023 and 0025]), said multi-piece reflector assembly including: a first reflector  
 16 having said first aperture disposed in an upper portion of said first reflector and an  
 17 opposed larger second aperture in a lower portion of said first reflector (e.g., Fig. 1  
 18 and [0022]), a second reflector having a first aperture positioned adjacent said  
 19 second aperture of said first reflector and a second aperture opposite said first  
 20 aperture of said second reflector and defining a light exit passageway (e.g., Fig. 1,  
 21 [0014], and [0022]), and a diffuser positioned proximal to and extending across said  
 22 second aperture of said first reflector and said first aperture of said second reflector  
 (e.g., Fig. 1 and 2; [0015], [0036], [0037], and [0043]).

24 **SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**  
 25 **(Prosecution History Estoppel and Disclaimer)**

26 Philips Lighting's claims for relief are limited and/or barred under the  
 27 doctrines of prosecution history estoppel and disclaimer by the actions,  
 28 representations, and conduct of the applicants for the asserted patents before the

1 Patent and Trademark Office during prosecution of the asserted patents. For  
 2 example, and without limitation, during prosecution of the '014 Patent, the  
 3 applicant expressly disclaimed any “voltage detection means” that “operates” other  
 4 than during an “abnormal condition.” For example, applicant stated:

5 To that end, the subject invention includes voltage detection means  
 6 for detecting the voltage across the output terminals. If the voltage  
 7 across the output terminals exceeds a predetermined threshold level,  
 8 which would be indicative of a fault situation, the voltage detection  
 9 means generates a detection signal. It should be noted that the voltage  
 10 detection means of the subject invention is not related to the  
 11 regulation of the output voltage during normal operation of the circuit  
 arrangement, when the control circuit regulates converter to control a  
 current at the output terminals. **Rather, the voltage detection means  
 only operates at the occurrence of an abnormal condition.**

12 (See November 1, 1999 Applicant’s Amendment at 6 (emphasis added).)

13 Accordingly, Philips Lighting is barred from claiming that the asserted claims of  
 14 the '014 Patent requiring a “voltage detection means” are infringed by LED lights  
 15 or components thereof in which the “voltage detection means” operates other than  
 16 at the occurrence of an abnormal condition.

17 **THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**  
 18 **(License and/or Exhaustion)**

19 Philips Lighting is precluded from asserting infringement and recovering  
 20 damages as to any products that are licensed or as to which any royalty already has  
 21 been paid, including, without limitation, any products obtained from a licensed  
 22 Philips entity or other third party. For example, Deco has purchased LED drivers  
 23 from Philips Lighting Electronics N.A. (including through subsidiary Philips  
 24 Bodine) and from Philips Lighting distributor Future Electronics. These products  
 25 include at least the following LED drivers: XH150C070V210CNF1;  
 26 LEDINTA0700C210DO; XI054C150V054DNT1; LEDHCNA0700C210DNF1;  
 27 LEDINTA1050C140DO; XI150C105V140CNF1; XI040C110V054VPT1;

28

1 XI054C150V054BST1; LEDHCNA0530C280DN; XI075C200V054VPT1;  
2 XI040C110V054BPT1; XH150C105V140CNF1; XI075C200V054BST1;  
3 71A9843600; and XI040C120V035CNJ1. On information and belief, these Philips  
4 Lighting drivers are licensed. One or more of these Philips Lighting drivers,  
5 including at least the XI054C150V054BST1 driver, have been incorporated into  
6 accused products, including the accused Cloud and/or DSW products.  
7 Accordingly, Philips Lighting is barred from asserting infringement of, or seeking a  
8 royalty on sales of, these components or products that allegedly infringe based on  
9 the incorporation of these components.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

**ADDITIONAL RESPONSES TO THE AMENDED COMPLAINT**

**FIRST ADDITIONAL RESPONSE**

**(Failure to State a Claim)**

The Amended Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

**SECOND ADDITIONAL RESPONSE**

**(Non-Infringement)**

Deco has not directly or indirectly infringed, and does not directly or indirectly infringe, any valid Asserted Claim, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

**THIRD ADDITIONAL RESPONSE**

**(Limitations Under 35 U.S.C. § 286)**

Philips Lighting is barred from recovering damages, in whole or in part, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 286. Philips Lighting cannot recover damages for any infringement committed more than six (6) years prior to the filing of the Complaint.

**FOURTH ADDITIONAL RESPONSE**

**(Adequate Remedy at Law)**

Philips Lighting has an adequate remedy at law and no basis exists for an injunction or other equitable relief.

**FIFTH ADDITIONAL RESPONSE**

**(Failure to Mark)**

Philips Lighting is barred from recovering pre-suit damages for any infringement of a patent to the extent that Philips Lighting or its licensees have failed to comply with the marking requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 287(a). Philips Lighting bears the burden of proof as to compliance with the marking statute, has not alleged facts giving rise to a reasonable inference that it has complied with that statute, and is barred from recovering pre-suit damages unless it proves compliance

1 with the marking statute.

2 Deco asserts that above affirmative defenses and additional responses to the  
3 Amended Complaint without the benefit of discovery and investigation and  
4 reserves the right to supplement and/or amend these defenses and responses as  
5 necessary.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

## **DECO ENTERPRISES, INC.'S AMENDED COUNTERCLAIMS**

Deco Enterprises, Inc. (d/b/a Deco Lighting) (“Deco”) for its counterclaims (“Counterclaims”) against Philips Lighting North America Corporation and Philips Lighting Holding B.V. (collectively, “Philips Lighting”) alleges as follows:

## **PARTIES**

1. Deco is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of California with its principal place of business at 2917 Vail Avenue, Commerce, California, 90040.

2. Upon information and belief, Philips Lighting North America Corporation is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Delaware with its principal place of business at 3 Burlington Woods Drive, Burlington, Massachusetts, 01803.

3. Upon information and belief, Philips Lighting Holding B.V. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the Netherlands with its principal place of business at High Tech Campus 45, 5656 AE Eindhoven, The Netherlands.

## **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

4. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over these Counterclaims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338, 2201 and/or 2202 and Rule 13 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

5. By filing its Complaint and Amended Complaint, agreeing to the transfer of this action to the Central District of California, and prosecuting its action in this Court, Philips Lighting has consented to the personal jurisdiction of this Court.

6. Venue is proper in this judicial district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

**COUNT I**  
**(Declaration of Invalidity of '014 Patent)**

7. Deco reasserts and re-alleges the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1-6 of these Counterclaims as if fully set forth herein.

8. An actual justiciable controversy exists between Deco and Philips Lighting regarding the alleged validity of Claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,094,014 (“014 Patent”).

9. Philips Lighting contends that it is the assignee and owner of all right, title, and interest in the '014 Patent and that the '014 Patent was validly and legally issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

10. Deco contends that Claim 1 of the '014 Patent is invalid under at least 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103, and/or 112.

11. Claim 1 of the '014 Patent is anticipated at least by U.S. Patent No. 5,532,894 to Sweaton and U.S. Patent No. 5,061,861 to Sameshima.

12. At least the following references, alone or in combination, render Claim 1 of the '014 Patent obvious: U.S. Patent No. 5,532,894 to Sweaton, U.S. Patent No. 5,061,861 to Sameshima, U.S. Patent No. 4,999,753 A to MacKenzie, U.S. Patent No. 5,327,123 to Heimann, U.S. Patent No. 5,387,908 to Henry, U.S. Patent No. 5,04,659 to Taniguchi, U.S. Patent No. 5,457,450 to Taniguchi, U.S. Patent No. 5,717,335 to Lee, and U.S. Patent No. 6,150,771 to Perry.

13. For example, as the Claim 1 terms appear to have been construed by Philips Lighting, Sweaton discloses a circuit arrangement suitable for operating a semiconductor light source (e.g., Fig. 4), input terminals for connecting a supply voltage (e.g., Fig. 3), input filter means (e.g., 5:23-29), a converter (e.g., Fig. 4; 4:65-67), output terminals for connecting the semiconductor light source (e.g., Fig. 4; 6:7-10), wherein said converter generates a current for application to said semiconductor light source, and said control circuit controls said converter to produce a predetermined value of said current at said output terminals (e.g., 4:65-67).

1 5:5), said predetermined value of said current corresponding to an output voltage  
 2 which is less than a predetermined threshold voltage characterized in that the circuit  
 3 arrangement further comprises voltage detection means for detecting the output  
 4 voltage at the output terminals, said voltage detection means generating a detection  
 5 signal when the output voltage exceeds said predetermined threshold voltage (*e.g.*,  
 6 5:23-33).

7 14. Claim 1 of the '014 Patent is not enabled at least because "voltage  
 8 detection means" is not used to regulate voltage and the claim also does not require  
 9 a "switching means" which is the only disclosed means to regulate voltage. Claim  
 10 1 of the '014 Patent is also indefinite because, for example, "input filter means" is  
 11 indefinite and it would not be clear to a person of ordinary skill in the art whether or  
 12 not "input filter means" requires a filter.

13 15. Deco's investigation into the invalidity of the '014 Patent is ongoing.  
 14 Deco reserves the right to make additional contentions regarding the invalidity of  
 15 the '014 Patent consistent with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and any  
 16 schedule entered in this action.

17 16. Deco seeks judgment from this Court that Claim 1 of the '014 Patent is  
 18 invalid.

19 **COUNT II**  
 20 **(Declaration of Invalidity of '890 Patent)**

21 17. Deco reasserts and re-alleges the allegations contained in  
 22 Paragraphs 1-16 of these Counterclaims as if fully set forth herein.

23 18. An actual justiciable controversy exists between Deco and Philips  
 24 Lighting regarding the alleged validity of Claims 7 and 31 of U.S. Patent  
 25 No. 6,586,890 ("'890 Patent").

26 19. Philips Lighting contends that it is the assignee and owner of all right,  
 27 title, and interest in the '890 Patent and that the '890 Patent was validly and legally  
 28 issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

1        20. Deco contends that Claims 7 and 31 of the '890 Patent are invalid  
 2 under at least 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and/or 103.

3        21. At least the following references, alone or in combination, render  
 4 Claims 7 and 31 of the '890 Patent obvious: WO2001069980A1 (Barth et al.), US  
 5 Patent No. 6,590,343 to Pederson, and US Patent No. 6,400,101 to Biebl et al.

6        22. For example, with respect to Claim 7 (and as the claim appears to have  
 7 been construed by Philips Lighting), Barth discloses a control circuit that provides  
 8 power to at least one LED (*e.g.*, Fig. 1), sensing current flowing through the LED  
 9 (*e.g.* Fig. 1 and 6), generating a reference signal (*e.g.*, Fig. 7 and 8), comparing the  
 10 sensed signal to the reference signal (*e.g.*, Fig. 1, 2, and 7), means for modulating  
 11 pulse width responsive to the feedback signal, said pulse width modulating means  
 12 generating a drive signal (*e.g.*, Fig. 1 and 7), and means for supplying power  
 13 responsive to the drive signal, said power supplying means supplying current to the  
 14 LED array (*e.g.*, Fig. 7 and 8a). Pederson discloses a system for supplying power  
 15 for an LED array (*e.g.*, 3:45-50), a microcontroller that senses current to an LED  
 16 module and generates a sensed current signal (*e.g.*, Figs. 24, 26, 20:47-54), a look-  
 17 up table for generating a reference signal (*e.g.*, Figs. 26-28, 21:61-22:20), a  
 18 microcontroller for comparing the sensed current signal and the reference signal  
 19 from the look-up table and an increased or decreased current signal (*e.g.*, Figs. 26-  
 20 28, 21:61-22:20), a microcontroller and compensation software for modulating  
 21 pulse width and generating a drive signal (Figs. 24, 26, 20:53-67), and a  
 22 microcontroller for adjusting the current to an LED replacement module responsive  
 23 to drive signal (*e.g.*, Figs. 27, 28, 24:66-25:18).

24        23. In addition, the United States Patent and Trademark Office already  
 25 invalidated Claim 23 of the '890 Patent, finding that Biebl discloses all of the  
 26 elements of Claim 23. Case IPR2015-01292, Paper 64, November 23, 2016. The  
 27 additional limitation of dependent Claim 31, as Philips Lighting appears to construe  
 28 that claim is disclosed by Barth. Barth discloses a power supply selected from a

1 group consisting of a buck-boost power supply, a boost power supply, a buck  
2 power supply, and a flyback converter (*e.g.*, Fig. 2).

3 24. Deco's investigation into the invalidity of the '890 Patent is ongoing.  
4 Deco reserves the right to make additional contentions regarding the invalidity of  
5 the '890 Patent consistent with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and any  
6 schedule entered in this action.

7        25. Deco seeks judgment from this Court that Claims 7 and 31 of the '890  
8 Patent are invalid.

**COUNT III**  
**(Declaration of Invalidity of '559 Patent)**

10        26. Deco reasserts and re-alleges the allegations contained in Paragraphs  
11        1-25 of these Counterclaims as if fully set forth herein.

12        27. An actual justiciable controversy exists between Deco and Philips  
13        Lighting regarding the alleged validity of Claims 6, 10, and 11 of U.S. Patent  
14        No. 7,262,559 (“559 Patent”).

15        28. Philips Lighting contends that it is the assignee and owner of all right,  
16        title, and interest in the '559 Patent and that the '559 Patent was validly and legally  
17        issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

18        29. Deco contends that Claims 6, 10, and 11 of the '559 Patent are invalid  
19 under at least 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103, and/or 112.

20 30. At least the following references, alone or in combination, render  
21 Claims 6, 10, and 11 of the '559 Patent obvious: US Patent No. 6,747,420 to Barth  
22 et al. and US Patent No. 4,496,939 to Moberg.

31. For example, with respect to Claim 6 (as Philips Lighting appears to construe that claim), Barth discloses a power supply for an LED light source (e.g., Fig. 1), a power converter operable to provide a regulated power including a LED current and a LED voltage (e.g., Fig. 1 and 6), an LED control switch operable to control a flow of the LED current through the LED light source (e.g., Fig. 2), a

1 detection circuit operable to provide a detection signal indicative of an operating  
 2 condition of the LED light source associated with the LED voltage (e.g., 1:42-57);  
 3 wherein said LED control switch is further operable to clamp a peak of the LED  
 4 current during an initial loading stage of the LED light source (e.g., 6:3-14);  
 5 wherein the detection signal has a first level representative of a load condition of  
 6 the LED light source (e.g., 1:42-57), and wherein the detection signal has a second  
 7 level representative of either a short condition or an open condition of the LED  
 8 light source (e.g., 5:54-6:26). In addition, Moberg discloses an oscillating control  
 9 and claim circuit to clamp a peak of the LED current during an initial loading stage  
 10 of the LED (e.g., Figs. 1-2, 3:63-4:12).

11       32. For example, with respect to Claim 10 (as Philips Lighting appears to  
 12 construe that claim), Barth discloses a power supply for an LED light source (e.g.,  
 13 Fig. 1), a power converter operable to provide a regulated power including a LED  
 14 current and a LED voltage (e.g., Fig. 1 and 6; 3:44-53), an LED control switch  
 15 operable to control a flow of the LED current through the LED light source (e.g.,  
 16 Fig. 2; 4:62-5:13), a current sensor operable to sense the LED current flowing  
 17 through the LED light source (e.g., Fig. 2 and 6; 1:42-57), a differential amplifier  
 18 (e.g., Fig. 2 and 6; 4:62-5:13), and means for adjusting a gain of said differential  
 19 amplifier (e.g., Fig. 6; 6:3-14), wherein said LED control switch is further operable  
 20 to clamp a peak of the LED current during an initial loading stage of the LED light  
 21 source (e.g., 6:3-14). In addition, Moberg discloses an oscillating control and claim  
 22 circuit to clamp a peak of the LED current during an initial loading stage of the LED  
 23 (e.g., Figs. 1-2, 3:63-4:12).

24       33. For example, with respect to Claim 11 (as Philips Lighting appears to  
 25 construe that claim), Barth discloses a power supply for an LED light source (e.g.,  
 26 Fig. 1), a power converter operable to provide a regulated power including a LED  
 27 current and a LED voltage (e.g., Fig. 1 and 6; 3:44-53), an LED control switch  
 28 operable to control a flow of the LED current through the LED light source (e.g.,

1 Fig. 2; 4:62-5:13), a voltage sensor operable to sense the LED voltage applied to  
2 the LED light source, said voltage sensor including (e.g., Fig. 2 and 6; 1:42-57), a  
3 differential amplifier (e.g., Fig. 2 and 6; 4:62-5:13), and means for adjusting a gain  
4 of said differential amplifier (e.g., Fig. 6; 6:3-14), wherein said LED control switch  
5 is further operable to clamp a peak of the LED current during an initial loading  
6 stage of the LED light source (e.g., 6:3-14). In addition, Moberg discloses an  
7 oscillating control and claim circuit to clamp a peak of the LED current during an  
8 initial loading stage of the LED (e.g., Figs. 1-2, 3:63-4:12).

9        34.    Claims 6, 10, and 11 of the '559 Patent are indefinite because, for  
10      example, "a power converter operable to provide regulated power including a LED  
11      current and a LED voltage" is indefinite and the corresponding structure is not  
12      disclosed and would not be clear to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

13       35. Deco's investigation into the invalidity of the '559 Patent is  
14 ongoing. Deco reserves the right to make additional contentions regarding the  
15 invalidity of the '559 Patent consistent with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure  
16 and any schedule entered in this action.

17       36. Deco seeks judgment from this Court that Claims 6, 10, and 11 of the  
18 '559 Patent are invalid.

**COUNT IV**  
**(Declaration of Invalidity of '399 Patent)**

21        37. Deco reasserts and re-alleges the allegations contained in Paragraphs  
22        1-35 of these Counterclaims as if fully set forth herein.

23       38. An actual justiciable controversy exists between Deco and Philips  
24 Lighting regarding the alleged validity of Claims 7 and 17 of U.S. Patent  
25 No. 7,038,399 (“399 Patent”).

26        39. Philips Lighting contends that it is the assignee and owner of all right,  
27 title, and interest in the '399 Patent and that the '399 Patent was validly and legally  
28 issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

1       40. Deco contends that Claims 7 and 17 of the '399 Patent are invalid  
 2 under at least 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and/or 103.

3       41. Claims 7 and 17 of the '399 Patent are anticipated at least by U.S.  
 4 Patent Appl. No. 2002/0122309A1 to Abdelhafez.

5       42. At least the following references, alone or in combination, render  
 6 Claims 7 and 17 of the '399 Patent obvious: U.S. Patent Appl. No.  
 7 2002/0122309A1 to Abdelhafez and U.S. Patent No. 6,225,759 to Bogdan.

8       43. For example, with respect to Claim 7 (as Philips Lighting appears to  
 9 construe that claim), Bogden in view of Abdelhafez discloses an illumination  
 10 apparatus (*e.g.*, Bogden at Abstract), an LED (*e.g.*, Abdelhafez at [0011]), at least  
 11 one controller coupled to the at least one LED and configured to receive a power-  
 12 related signal from an alternating current (A.C.) power source that provides signals  
 13 other than a standard A.C. line voltage, the at least one controller further configured  
 14 to provide power to the at least one LED based on the power-related signal (*e.g.*,  
 15 Bogden at Fig. 1 and 3(a)-(d); 2:41-3:5), wherein the A.C. power source is an A.C.  
 16 dimmer circuit (*e.g.*, Bogdan Fig. 1), wherein the A.C. dimmer circuit is controlled  
 17 by a user interface to vary the power-related signal, and wherein the at least one  
 18 controller is configured to variably control at least one parameter of light generated  
 19 by the at least one LED in response to operation of the user interface (*e.g.*, Bogdan  
 20 at 5:17-27, 14:52-15:7; Abdelhafez at [0040], [0046]), and wherein the operation of  
 21 the user interface varies a duty cycle of the power-related signal, and wherein the at  
 22 least one controller is configured to variably control the at least one parameter of  
 23 the light based at least on the variable duty cycle of the power-related signal (*e.g.*,  
 24 Bogden at 10:5-35, 11:12-22, Fig. 5(a) and (b)).

25       44. For example, with respect to Claim 17 (as Philips Lighting appears to  
 26 construe that claim), Bogden in view of Abdelhafez discloses an illumination  
 27 apparatus (*e.g.*, Bogden at Abstract), an LED (*e.g.*, Abdelhafez at [0011]), at least  
 28 one controller coupled to the at least one LED and configured to receive a power-

related signal from an alternating current (A.C.) power source that provides signals other than a standard A.C. line voltage, the at least one controller further configured to provide power to the at least one LED based on the power-related signal (e.g., Bogden at Fig. 1 and 3(a)-(d); 2:41-3:5), wherein the A.C. power source is an A.C. dimmer circuit (e.g., Bogdan Fig. 1), wherein the A.C. dimmer circuit is controlled by a user interface to vary the power-related signal, and wherein the at least one controller is configured to variably control at least one parameter of light generated by the at least one LED in response to operation of the user interface (e.g., Bogdan at 5:17-27, 14:52-15:7; Abdelhafez at [0040], [0046]), wherein the at least one controller includes: an adjustment circuit to variably control the at least one parameter of light based on the varying power-related signal (e.g., Bogden at 10:5-35, 11:12-22, Fig. 5(a) and (b)), and power circuitry to provide at least the power to the at least one LED based on the varying power-related signal (e.g., Bogden Fig. 1 and 6(b), 5:10-14).

15        45. Deco's investigation into the invalidity of the '399 Patent is  
16 ongoing. Deco reserves the right to make additional contentions regarding the  
17 invalidity of the '399 Patent consistent with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure  
18 and any schedule entered in this action.

19        46. Deco seeks judgment from this Court that Claims 7 and 17 of the '399  
20 Patent are invalid.

**COUNT V**  
**(Declaration of Invalidity of '328 Patent)**

23        47. Deco reasserts and re-alleges the allegations contained in Paragraphs  
24        1-45 of these Counterclaims as if fully set forth herein.

25        48. An actual justiciable controversy exists between Deco and Philips  
26 Lighting regarding the alleged validity of Claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 8,070,328  
27 (“328 Patent”).

28 49. Philips Lighting contends that it is the assignee and owner of all right,

1 title, and interest in the '328 Patent and that the '328 Patent was validly and legally  
 2 issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

3 50. Deco contends that Claim 1 of the '328 Patent is invalid under at least  
 4 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and/or 103.

5 51. Claim 1 of the '328 Patent is anticipated at least by U.S. Patent Appl.  
 6 Publ. No. 2009/0067172A1 to Inoue.

7 52. At least the following references, alone or in combination, render  
 8 Claim 1 of the '328 Patent obvious: U.S. Patent Appl. Publ. No. 2009/0067172A1  
 9 to Inoue and U.S. Patent No. 6,033,093 to Latsis.

10 53. For example, with respect to Claim 1 (as Philips Lighting appears to  
 11 construe that claim), Inoue discloses an LED downlight fixture (e.g., [0002]), an  
 12 array of LEDs in thermal connectivity with a heatsink, said array of LEDs  
 13 positioned adjacent a first aperture of a multi-piece reflector assembly (e.g., [0023  
 14 and 0025]), said multi-piece reflector assembly including: a first reflector having  
 15 said first aperture disposed in an upper portion of said first reflector and an opposed  
 16 larger second aperture in a lower portion of said first reflector (e.g., Fig. 1 and  
 17 [0022]), a second reflector having a first aperture positioned adjacent said second  
 18 aperture of said first reflector and a second aperture opposite said first aperture of  
 19 said second reflector and defining a light exit passageway (e.g., Fig. 1, [0014], and  
 20 [0022]), and a diffuser positioned proximal to and extending across said second  
 21 aperture of said first reflector and said first aperture of said second reflector (e.g.,  
 22 Fig. 1 and 2; [0015], [0036], [0037], and [0043]).

23 54. Deco's investigation into the invalidity of the '328 Patent is  
 24 ongoing. Deco reserves the right to make additional contentions regarding the  
 25 invalidity of the '014 Patent consistent with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure  
 26 and any schedule entered in this action.

27 55. Deco seeks judgment from this Court that Claim 1 of the '328 Patent is  
 28 invalid.

## **Prayer for Relief**

WHEREFORE, Deco prays for the following relief:

- 3 a) that this Court enter a declaratory judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
- 4 § 2201 that Claim 1 of the '014 Patent is invalid;
- 5 b) that this Court enter a declaratory judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
- 6 § 2201 that Claims 7 and 31 of the '890 Patent are invalid;
- 7 c) that this Court enter a declaratory judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
- 8 § 2201 that Claims 6,10, and 11 of the '559 Patent are invalid;
- 9 d) that this Court enter a declaratory judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
- 10 § 2201 that Claims 7 and 17 of the '399 Patent are invalid;
- 11 e) that this Court enter a declaratory judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
- 12 § 2201 that Claim 1 of the '328 Patent is invalid;
- 13 f) that this Court deny the relief sought by Philips' Amended Complaint
- 14 and Prayer for Relief;
- 15 g) that this Court adjudge and decree that this case is exceptional and
- 16 award Deco its reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses and costs in this action
- 17 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285; and
- 18 h) that this Court grant Deco whatever other and further relief it deems
- 19 just and proper.

## **JURY DEMAND**

Deco demands a trial by jury on all claims, counterclaims, and issues so triable.

Dated: August 31, 2017

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
NICOLE M. SMITH  
KYLE W.K. MOONEY

By: /s/ Nicole M. Smith  
NICOLE M. SMITH

Attorneys for Defendant  
DECO ENTERPRISES, INC.